

RACHEL B. ABRAMS (Cal Bar No. 209316)
 ADAM B. WOLF (Cal Bar No. 215914)
 SARA B. CRAIG (Cal Bar No. 301290)
Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP
 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: 415.766.3544
 Facsimile: 415.840.9435
 Email: rabrums@peifferwolf.com
 Email: awolf@peifferwolf.com
 Email: scraig@peifferwolf.com

TIFFANY R. ELLIS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP
 15 E. Baltimore Ave
 Detroit, MI 48202
 Telephone: (313) 572-4727
 Facsimile: (415) 840-9435
 Email: tellis@peifferwolf.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
 PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
 LITIGATION

MDL No. 3084 CRB

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
 WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR JESSI
 WATT**

This Document Relates to:

Honorable Charles R. Breyer

*Jessi Watt v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
 3:25-cv-04704-CRB*

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR JESSI
 WATT**

Counsel for Plaintiff Jessi Watt respectfully submits this reply in support of their motion to withdraw as counsel. *See Docket No. 4573*. This motion was filed after diligent efforts to continue communication with Plaintiff. Unfortunately, circumstances outside counsel's control—including the inability to reach Plaintiff and maintain consistent communication—have made continued representation impractical and unreasonably difficult.

1 Defendants have raised collateral concerns regarding Plaintiff's obligations under PTO
2 10. Nevertheless, the communication breakdown between attorney and client underscores the
3 impossibility of effective representation under current conditions.

4 A breakdown in communication and trust between attorney and client constitutes good
5 cause for withdrawal, particularly where withdrawal will not prejudice other parties or delay
6 proceedings. The Court has broad discretion to permit withdrawal under such circumstances, and
7 courts in this Circuit have consistently found it appropriate when counsel cannot maintain contact
8 or cooperation with their clients.

9
10 Under California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(b)(4), withdrawal is permitted when
11 a client renders it unreasonably difficult for counsel to carry out representation effectively. Courts
12 consider four factors when ruling on a motion to withdraw: (1) the reason for withdrawal, (2)
13 potential prejudice to other litigants, (3) impact on the administration of justice, and (4) delay in
14 resolving the case. *See Riese v. County of Del Norte*, 2013 WL 6056606, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov.
15 14, 2013). Each factor supports withdrawal here.

16
17 1. Reason for Withdrawal. Counsel cannot meaningfully respond to Defendants' filings
18 or advance the litigation without input from the Plaintiff. This factor favors withdrawal.

19 2. Prejudice to Other Litigants. Plaintiff is not a bellwether selected case. Plaintiff will
20 receive all relevant materials and can obtain new counsel, proceed *pro se*, or choose not to pursue
21 further action. There is no delay or prejudice to other litigants.

22 3. Administration of Justice. Withdrawal will not disrupt the overall MDL proceedings.
23 This case is among more than 2,500 and has no bearing on bellwether scheduling or trials.

24
25 4. Delay in Resolution. The earliest potential trial date remains months away, and
26 permitting withdrawal now will not delay the MDL process. Courts routinely grant withdrawal
27 under similar circumstances where client noncommunication prevents effective advocacy. *See*,
28 *e.g., Capital Commc'ns v. Lucent Techs.*, 2004 WL 201596 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 16, 2004); *El Hage v.*

1 *U.S. Sec. Assocs.*, 2007 WL 4328809 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2007); and *Hershey v. Berkeley*, 2008
 2 WL 4723610 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2008).

3
 4 Defendants' response inaccurately insinuates that Plaintiff's counsel failed to adhere to its
 5 duty to conduct a reasonable factual investigation prior to filing this complaint. *See Docket No.*
 6 *4642*. This assertion is baseless and contradicts Plaintiff's filed declaration. *See Docket No. 4573*.
 7 As declared, between December 21, 2024, and June 4, 2025, Plaintiff Jessi Watt did contact our
 8 office on six (6) occasions. Defendants mischaracterize our firm's handling of this case and
 9 communication with Plaintiff Jessi Watt.

10 Counsel has made diligent efforts, but is unable to communicate with this Plaintiff, leaving
 11 counsel unable to continue representation. This Court has previously granted similar motions: *see*
 12 *Docket No. 4426 and 4427*. Under these circumstances, counsel's motion to withdraw should be
 13 granted for Plaintiff Jessi Watt.

14 CONCLUSION

15
 16 For these reasons, counsel's Motion to Withdraw for Plaintiff Jessi Watt should be
 17 granted.

18 DATED: December 23, 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

19 By: /s/ Rachel Abrams

20 RACHEL B. ABRAMS (Cal Bar No. 209316)
 21 ADAM B. WOLF (Cal Bar No. 215914)
 22 SARA B. CRAIG (Cal Bar No. 301290)
Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP
 23 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820
 24 San Francisco, CA 94111
 25 Telephone: 415.766.3544
 26 Facsimile: 415.840.9435
 27 Email: rabrams@peifferwolf.com
 28 awolf@peifferwolf.com
 scraig@peifferwolf.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 23, 2025, I electronically transmitted the foregoing **REPLY IN SUPPORT OF WITHDRAW** to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing thereby transmitting a Notice of Electronic Filing to all CM/ECF registrants.

By: /s/ Rachel B. Abrams
RACHEL B. ABRAMS